

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 have been examined and rejected on prior art grounds. Claims 2, 4, 6, and 7 are hereby canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Hence, claims 1, 3, 5, 8, and 9 are all the claims pending in the application.

***Claim Rejections***

The Examiner has rejected claims 5-6 and 8-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,803,929 to Hinegardner (hereinafter “Hinegardner”). The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hinegardner in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0143985 to Goldstein et al. (hereinafter “Goldstein”). The Examiner has rejected claims 4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hinegardner in view of Goldstein and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0076364 to Martinez et al. (hereinafter “Martinez”). Applicants submit that the claims are patentable.

**Claims 5, 8, and 9**

For example, claim 5 recites that the latest copied or cut data is stored in the basic clipboard and other data stored in the basic clipboard is stored in the multi-clipboard if said latest copied or cut data has been stored in the basic clipboard. On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Hinegardner and Goldstein do not teach the above limitation, and relies on Martinez to supply this deficiency. However, Martinez merely discloses that a copy command may be executed to transfer an object 26 onto a clipboard (paragraph 19). Martinez does not teach that other data stored in this clipboard is stored in another clipboard. Thus,

Hinegardner, Goldstein, and Martinez, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest that the latest copied or cut data is stored in the basic clipboard and other data stored in the basic clipboard is stored in the multi-clipboard if said latest copied or cut data has been stored in the basic clipboard, as required by claim 5.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner seems to ignore the numerous arguments submitted in the Response filed September 27, 2007, and asserts that “the applicant substantially argues the same points as presented in the previous submission filed [April 30, 2007].” The Examiner merely repeats the previous viewpoint of Hinegardner in which a user can set an interval for pasting the file into a queue at zero seconds for a first action sequence of moving/copying a file into the queue. The Examiner contends that if the interval is zero seconds, the paste would occur instantaneously and therefore would allegedly happen before a counter is greater than the interval.

However, as previously asserted, regardless of what the user sets the minimum time interval to, Hinegardner requires that the pointer be held down for *at least* the minimum time period (See at least col. 4, lines 4-7 and lines 35-40; col. 5, lines 45-59). Thus, Hinegardner does not teach displaying data stored in a multi-clipboard if the predetermined amount of time has passed, as required by claim 5. The Examiner does not address this previously asserted argument.

Even if the paste were instantaneous, as asserted by the Examiner, all of the limitations of the claims would not be met. In particular, independent claim 5 inherently indicates that an amount of time is measured and compared to a predetermined amount of time. As previously

asserted, in the Examiner's interpretation of an instantaneous paste, no amount of time is measured and no comparison to time is made.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner also asserts that a time interval is set by a user between the first action of moving/copying the file to the queue and the second action of moving/copying the file to its permanent location. This second time interval appears to be irrelevant, as the claims only recite one predetermined amount of time. Moreover, Hinegardner's time period is not a set amount of time, as any number of operations may take place in the time period (col. 6, lines 10-20). Thus, Hinegardner's second time interval could not correspond to the claimed *predetermined* amount of time.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claim 5 is patentable and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection. Applicants also submit that claims 8 and 9, being dependent on claim 5, are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

#### Claims 1 and 3

Independent claim 1 recites features similar to those discussed above regarding claim 5. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable at least for reasons analogous to those discussed above regarding claim 5. Applicants also submit that claim 3 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1. Thus, withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

#### ***Conclusion***

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the


AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)  
U.S. Application No.: 10/743,313

Attorney Docket No.: Q79032

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Peter A. McKenna  
Registration No. 38,551

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 31, 2007